REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MARINE CORPS EQUIPMENT READINE 100440Z FEB 06

I&L

We have read your message and we will wait for responses from the MEF's before we make any recommendation or comments.

PP&O

Concerning the one number for SORTS. We have been working with OSD P&R to automate the GSORTS report. Here's how we view the auto-generation of the SORTS S and R ratings. Same equipment population. TFSMS provides unit allowances (One stop shop for T/O and T/E). SASSY provides On Hand data. Mimms provides material condition of on hand data. Is that similar enough to your view so that it will work?

Concur with your assessment (referring to comments submitted by LOGCOM S&A). However, 100% accuracy was never a pre-requisite. It is a goal, that we should strive for. We need to expose the data to the light of day in order to give us something more than close enough.

LOGCOM (S&A)

One significant challenge related to the migration of LMIS to TFSMS is the accuracy of the data showing the relationships between Unit Identification Codes (UICs)and Activity Address Codes (AACs). It is this relational data that allows decision makers and planners to adequately understand ("see") the Marine Corps' equipment posture in SASSY (who possesses the equipment, where is it and how much there is). Currently this relational data is incomplete/inaccurate. TFSMS and SASSY system admins, MARFOR SMEs and programmers are working to improve the accuracy of this data. Since TFSMS is the system that will store, manage the UIC - AAC relational data as well as feed allowance levels to SASSY we need to make sure the data is "accurate enough" before actually implementing the "One Number" readiness concept...it may be unrealistic to expect we will ever achieve 100% accuracy...

MARFORRES

The intent of the message is good (begin discussion of One Number).

The verbiage needs a little bit of work, but it is logical and addresses the main points.

The methodology is completely backwards I believe. Please let me explain with a question. Why are we considering releasing a Force-level message regarding One Number when this is an MRIPT issue that we have planned to conclude our decision during the next MRIPT? I would strongly recommend that we gain consensus from all stake holder at the MRIPT, and THEN have a message released...but from HQMC. The HQMC message can address those same issues to all MarFors so well articulated in the below message, but I think it is misguided to start releasing Major Command-level messages on HQMC policy and intentions.

This was an MRIPT initiative (a Major from MFR was the first to bring it up as a matter of fact). That is the venue it should remain in.

...also believe it is premature pending the collective MRIPT conclusions, though I think we will end up agreeing to something very similar to what was drafted below. Some difficult issues need to be addressed (i.e. if MARES is no longer the "Truth Indicator", how can we possibly have confidence in Auth/OH numbers (supply's) we know to be faulty?//is there any way to make the property control/voucher process any more manageable?).

PAC

(Referring to comments submitted by MARFORRES) I would like to begin by stating up front that the our message was simply to solicit comments from PAC units on the One Number concept. The message was released with the intent to best prepare ourselves for the discussions on this subject during the upcoming MRIPT. I understand completely that the One Number concept is still in the conceptual phase and no decision has been made on it's adoption; however, as our message neither takes a position nor dictates policy with regards to the one number concept - we feel justified in it's release and the discussions it has stimulated. That said, we are pleased to have opened the discussion to our subordinate MEFs, their MSCs and others so that when and if a decision is made on this matter, it will not have been in a vacuum.

Whatever is decided during the next MRIPT will affect the entirety of the Marine Corps, and in that vein, it is critical that the decision process include the voices of our Marines.

LOGCOM (SCMC)

 1st Marine Division has done a superb job of reconciling the data in TFSMS and ensure the correct UIC/AAC assignments are made. Their efforts are reflected in

the accuracy of the data they now receive. The TECHDATA issues identified are being addressed by a joint TFS and LOGCOM team. We are looking at both a short term correction and long term solutions to keep the data correct.

  I agree that the allowances we use in all our reporting should come from one source, however, I would be cautious in making MERIT a transactional system. Inducting, warehousing and managing the RM4 remarks in MERIT might not be the best way to go. If we leverage the requirement to manage RM4 Remarks independent of MARES on PM-LIS and PM-GCSS-MC, they could decide the technical solution.

1st MARDIV

To add to this- 1st Marine Division has reconciled the Company UIC as it relates to the SASSY AAC. It took us over a month to get this corrected. Our allowances are posted correctly as for now. I did notice that the errors existed throughout the DATA I had pulled. As an example 2nd Bn 11th Mar and 3rd Bn 11th Mar both had an extra battery. Those extra batterys were actually identified as UPD (Pre-OIF). That would have left allowance shortages in 3rd Marine Division . Also we had an extra AAV Co associated to 3rd AABn this is normally UPD to Oki with 3rd CAB. We have reported these to 3rd MarDiv Supply, III MEF Supply, & TFSMS to make these changes.

Another problem is the TECHDATA association with primary NSNs for TAMCN. As an example TFSMS is posting an allowance to a substitute NSN for TAMCN E1152 AN/PVS 7B vice the AN/PVS 7D. After researching the MHIF, IM (Albany), & FEDLOG, the NSN for the AN/PVS 7D is the primary NSN. The IM(Albany) is working to fix this with TFSMS. However, there are other NSNs that are listed with NSNs with "0000-00-000-0000 BLANK FORMS" on our MALs (TAMCN: A0873).

I agree that the allowance should come from a single source and that is on the LUAF/MAL (HQMC Allowance; Special Allowance; Total Allowance). Additionally, the RM4 remarks is recommend to state the supporting justification for any special allowance or command adjust. Leave the RM4 available for the commanders to report significant info as already been predefined in the MCO 3000.11_. Allowing a RM4 capability into a MERIT table would be the next step into GCSS-MC. I am sure this has been thought of already, but permissions will need to be implemented so that it would track changes made by the individual if allowed onto MERIT directly. Lastly, MAREs should remain and be re-evaluated by those S3/G3 to identify those critical COMM, Eng, MT, Ord systems from SAC 1 to SAC 3 PEIs. 1st Marine Division has identified roughly 152 critical war fighting equipment across the Division that are both MARES and not MARES. These are what we are tracking on supply readiness.

LOGCOM (S&A)

Currently SASSY is the source for MARES authorized and possessed allowances, this concept is not new. MERIT highlights the fact that in some cases the SASSY/ MARES reconciliation process is flawed or simply is not being conducted. The Supply Officer is ultimately charged with asset accountability within his/her command, not the Maintenances Officer. If put in terms of a private checking account, no one would stand for two different account balances being reported dependent on which teller they inquired through. What is being proposed here is eliminating the need for the MMO to manually obtain the authorized and possessed quantities from SASSY for inclusion in MARES.

MARES was never intended to be used as the forum to dispute "what's on deck/is it ours" arguments, those issues should be resolved prior to reporting resulting in applicable RM-4 Remarks were there are difference. MERIT should remain a read only decision support tool. However, that is not to say that the LCMI infrastructure can not support a transactional module capable of improving readiness reporting. MARES can and should be retired. LCMI has always had the potential to replace MARES and improve data quality and accuracy. At LCMI's disposal is the technical and functional expertise necessary to accomplish this in relatively short period of time with a seamless transition. Ironically, LCMI is in sync with GCSS-MC and it is with respect to the GCSS-MC mission that this and other initiatives are held in abeyance.

Until the Marine Corps orders requiring readiness of selected items to be reported through MARES are changed, MERIT should continue to display readiness under the current processes as it reflects the official view. Accordingly, any new/dual process that is displayed by MERIT should be looked at as a proof of concept. Remarks detailing the status of equipment (RM-4 Remarks) are essential and should continue to be part of any new view/reporting system being developed.